

Serving as the Governor's chief advisor, Rudy was also selected to be a member of the Commission on Self-Determination, tasked with the responsibility of charting Guam's future political relationship with the United States of America. This was his second appointment to the commission, the first during the Bordallo-Reyes administration of the island from 1983 until 1987.

During his first term as a member of the Commission on Self-Determination, Rudy is credited with participating in the drafting of the Guam Commonwealth Draft Act. His participation was highlighted with his expertise in airlines, travel, and communications. Rudy continued his support for the Commonwealth Act after the Bordallo-Reyes administration ended. Most notably he testified at the only congressional hearings to have been held on the Guam Commonwealth Draft Act in Honolulu, HI, during December 1989. Entrusted by the Governor, Rudy joined the other members of Team Guam and participated in the 1995 Base Reuse and Realignment Commission hearings held in San Francisco this past year.

It is with a sense of great loss that another distinguished island leader has passed away before the political status issues between Guam and the United States are resolved. It is for this reason, Mr. Speaker, that I especially mourn the loss of Lieutenant Governor Sablan. His perseverance on these issues will not go unnoticed. I am committed to continue his legacy of leadership in this realm. May his lifelong commitment to these issues not be neglected by our Federal Government and energize the people of Guam.

Mr. Speaker, as Guam mourns the death of this fine leader, let us pay him tribute by honoring him in our body today. He will be remembered as a strong and highly respected gentleman. Let him serve as a model of what an exceptional citizen should be, here as in Guam. He was a good friend, one of Guam's most respected leaders and a great contributor to Guam's struggle for dignity with its relationship with the Federal Government and the world.

THE HEROIC EFFORTS OF MAJ. JAY ZEAMER, JR. IN WORLD WAR II

HON. JOHN ELIAS BALDACCI

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1995

Mr. BALDACCI. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to speak today about an exceptional Mainer who served this country with great honor and courage during one of history's most terrifying wars, World War II.

Maj. Jay Zeamer, Jr., exhibited uncommon courage and skill to complete his mission in the face of insurmountable odds. He was awarded this country's highest honor, the Congressional Medal of Honor. I would like to honor him again as the 50th anniversary of the end of World War II nears.

Major Zeamer entered the service when he resided in Machias, ME. The Major was a volunteer bomber pilot who was charged with mapping a heavily defended region in the Solomon Islands. Even under the threat of a formidable Japanese fighter attack, Major Zeamer continued with his mission. In the en-

ding fight, the crew destroyed five enemy aircraft. It was the Major's superior maneuvering ability that allowed the outnumbered bomber to successfully engage the enemy. All this was accomplished even though Major Zeamer was shot in both legs and both arms. Although he was seriously wounded, the Major did not give up until the enemy fighters had retreated. Mr. Speaker, it was courageous soldiers like this that allowed the United States to repel Japanese advances in the Pacific.

Maine has a long and proud tradition of sending brave soldiers to fight for freedom at home and abroad. These brave men exhibited enormous skill and unbreakable courage in the face of death. From Joshua Chamberlain in the Civil War through Gary Gordon in Somalia and countless numbers in between, Maine patriots have fought so that others might live free.

I am proud of Major Zeamer for all that he has given to the world. He fought not only for America, but to free the world from one of the most dangerous threats it had ever known. The efforts of Major Zeamer and his fellow soldiers helped purge the Pacific of Japanese imperialism. This country and the world will never forget his sacrifice.

ONE NATION, ONE COMMON LANGUAGE

HON. TOBY ROTH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1995

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call the attention of my colleagues to the August issue of Reader's Digest and the article, "One Nation, One Common Language." The author, Linda Chavez, makes a compelling case against bilingual education and for preserving our common bond, the English language.

Ms. Chavez points out that immigrants oppose bilingual education for their children and teachers oppose it for their students. Listen to the commonsense observation on bilingual education's shortcomings that elementary school teacher Gail Fiber makes: "How can anyone learn English in school when they speak Spanish 4½ hours a day?"

A recent survey showed that in just 5 years, there will be 40 million Americans who can't speak English. Those Americans will be isolated, cut off from realizing the American dream, if they don't have the one skill that is required for success in America: Fluency in English.

Linda Chavez in her article calls for an end to mandatory bilingual education at the State and Federal level, and she's absolutely right. My bill, H.R. 739, would do just that. I hope you all join me in my effort to make English our official language and keep America one Nation, one people. Cosponsor H.R. 739, the Declaration of Official Language Act. I ask that the full text of her article appear in the RECORD at this point.

ONE NATION, ONE COMMON LANGUAGE

(By Linda Chavez)

Lusi Granados was a bright five-year-old who could read simple words before he entered kindergarten in Sun Valley, Calif. But soon after the school year began, his mother was told that he couldn't keep up. Yolanda Granados was bewildered. "He knows his alphabet," she assured the teacher.

"You don't understand," the teacher explained. "The use of both Spanish and English in the classroom is confusing to him."

Yolanda Granados was born in Mexico but speaks excellent English. Simply because Spanish is sometimes spoken in her household, however, the school district—without consulting her—put her son in bilingual classes. "I sent Luis to school to learn English," she declares.

When she tried to put her boy into regular classes, she was given the runaround. "Every time I went to the school," she says, "the principal gave me some excuse." Finally, Granados figured out a way to get around the principal, who has since left the school.

Each school year, she had to meet with Luis's teachers to say she wanted her son taught solely in English. They cooperated with her, but Luis was still officially classified as a bilingual student until he entered the sixth grade.

Immigrant parents want their kids to learn English. Why, then, do we have a multibillion-dollar bureaucracy to promote bilingual education?

Unfortunately, the Granados family's experience has become common around the country. When bilingual education was being considered by Congress, it had a limited mission: to teach children of Mexican descent in Spanish while they learned English. Instead, it has become an expensive behemoth, often with a far-reaching political agenda: to promote Spanish among Hispanic children—regardless of whether they speak English or not, regardless of their parents' wishes and even without their knowledge. For instance:

In New Jersey last year, Hispanic children were being assigned to Spanish-speaking classrooms, the result of a state law that mandated bilingual instruction. Angry parents demanded freedom of choice. But when a bill to end the mandate was introduced in the legislature, a group of 50 bilingual advocates testified against it at a state board of education meeting.

"Why would we require parents unfamiliar with our educational system to make such a monumental decision when we are trained to make those decisions?" asked Joseph Ramos, then co-chairman of the North Jersey Bilingual Council.

The Los Angeles Unified School District educates some 265,000 Spanish-speaking children, more than any other in the nation. It advises teachers, in the words of the district's Bilingual Methodology Study Guide, "not to encourage minority parents to switch to English in the home, but to encourage them to strongly promote development of the primary language." Incredibly, the guide also declares that "excessive use of English in bilingual classrooms tends to lower students' achievement in English."

In Denver, 2500 students from countries such as Russia and Vietnam learn grammar, vocabulary and pronunciation in ESL (English as a Second Language). An English "immersion" program, ESL is the principal alternative to bilingual education. Within a few months, most ESL kids are taking mathematics, science and social-studies classes in English.

But the 11,000 Hispanic children in Denver public schools don't have the choice to participate in ESL full time. Instead, for their first few years they are taught most of the day in Spanish and are introduced only gradually to English. Jo Thomas, head of the bilingual/ESL education program for the Denver public schools, estimates these kids will ultimately spend on average five to seven years in its bilingual program.

ACTIVIST TAKEOVER.

Bilingual education began in the late 1960s as a small, \$75-million federal program primarily for Mexican-American children, half

of whom could not speak English when they entered first grade. The idea was to teach them in Spanish for a short period, until they got up to speed in their new language.

Sen. Ralph Yarborough (D., Texas), a leading sponsor of the first federal bilingual law in 1968, explained that its intent was "to make children fully literate in English." Yarborough assured Congress that the purpose was "not to make the mother tongue dominant."

Unfortunately, bilingual-education policy soon fell under the sway of political activists demanding recognition of the "group rights" of cultural and linguistic minorities. By the late 1970s the federal civil-rights office was insisting that school districts offer bilingual education to Hispanic and other "language minority" students or face a cutoff of federal funds.

Most states followed suit, adopting bilingual mandates either by law or by bureaucratic edict. The result is that, nationally, most first-grade students from Spanish-speaking homes are taught to read and write in Spanish.

The purpose in many cases is no longer to bring immigrant children into the mainstream of American life. Some advocates see bilingual education as the first step in a radical transformation of the United States into a nation without one common language or fixed borders.

Spanish "should no longer be regarded as a 'foreign' language," according to Josué González, director of bilingual education in the Carter Administration and now a professor at Columbia University Teachers College. Instead, he writes in *Reinventing Urban Education*, Spanish should be "a second national language."

Others have even more extreme views. At last February's annual conference of the National Association for Bilingual Education (a leading lobbying group for supporters of bilingual education) in Phoenix, several speakers challenged the idea of U.S. sovereignty and promoted the notion that the Southwest and northern Mexico form one cultural region, which they dub *La Frontera*.

Eugene García, head of bilingual education at the U.S. Department of Education, declared to thunderous applause that "the border for many is nonexistent. For me, for intellectual reasons, that border shall be nonexistent." His statement might surprise President Clinton, who appointed García and has vowed to beef up border protection to stem the flow of illegal aliens into the United States.

I WAS FURIOUS

Bilingual education has grown tremendously from its modest start. Currently, some 2.4 million children are eligible for bilingual or ESL classes, with bilingual education alone costing over \$5.5 billion. New York City, for instance, spends \$400 million annually on its 147,500 bilingual students—\$2712 per pupil.

A great deal of this money is being wasted. "We don't even speak Spanish at home," says Miguel Alvarado of Sun Valley, Calif., yet his eight-year-old daughter, Emily, was put in a bilingual class. Alvarado concludes that this was done simply because he is bilingual.

When my son Pablo entered school in the District of Columbia, I received a letter notifying me that he would be placed in a bilingual program—even though Pablo didn't speak a word of Spanish, since I grew up not speaking it either. (My family has lived in what is now New Mexico since 1609). I was able to decline the program without much trouble, but other Hispanic parents aren't always so fortunate.

When Rita Montero's son, Camilo, grew bored by the slow academic pace of his first-

grade bilingual class in Denver, she requested a transfer. "The kids were doing work way below the regular grade level," says Montero. "I was furious." Officials argued they were under court order to place him in a bilingual class.

In fact, she was entitled to sign a waiver, but no one she met at school informed her of this. Ultimately she enrolled Camilo in a magnet school across town. Says Montero, "Only through a lot of determination and anger did I get my son in the classroom where he belonged." Most parents—especially immigrants—aren't so lucky. They're intimidated by the system, and their kids are stuck.

Most school districts with large Hispanic populations require parents with Spanish surnames to fill out a "home-language survey." If parents report that Spanish is used in the home, even occasionally, the school may place the child in bilingual classes. Unbeknownst to parents, a Spanish-speaking grandparent living with the family may be enough to trigger placement, even if the grandchild speaks little or no Spanish.

Though parents are supposed to be able to opt out, bureaucrats have vested interest in discouraging them, since the school will lose government funds. In some districts, funding for bilingual education exceeds that for mainstream classes by 20 percent or more. New York State, for example, doesn't allow Hispanic students to exist the bilingual program until they score above the 40th percentile on a standardized English test.

"There's a Catch-22 operating here," says Christine Rossell, a professor of political science at Boston University. She explains that such testing guarantees enrollment in the program, for "by definition, 40 percent of all students who take any standardized test will score at or below the 40th percentile."

FAMILY'S BUSINESS

Bilingual programs are also wasted on children who do need help learning English. Studies confirm what common sense would tell you: the less time you spend speaking a new language, the more slowly you'll learn it.

Last year, bilingual and ESL programs in New York City were compared. Results: 92 percent of Korean, 87 percent of Russian, and 83 percent of Chinese children who started intensive ESL classes in kindergarten had made it into mainstream classes in three years or less. Of the Hispanic students in bilingual classes, only half made it to mainstream classes within three years. "How can anyone learn English in school when they speak Spanish 4½ hours a day?" asks Gail Fiber, an elementary-school teacher in Southern California. "In more than seven years' experience with bilingual education, I've never seen it done successfully."

Rosalie Pedalino Porter, former director of bilingual education in Newton, Mass, and now with the Institute for Research in English Acquisition and Development, reached a similar conclusion. "I felt that I was deliberately holding back the learning of English," she writes in her eloquent critique, *Forked Tongue: The Politics of Bilingual Education*.

Native-language instruction is not even necessary to academic performance, according to Boston University's Rossell. "Ninety-one percent of scientifically valid studies show bilingual education to be no better—or actually worse—than doing nothing." In other words, students who are allowed to sink or swim in all-English classes are actually better off than bilingual students.

The overwhelming majority of immigrants believe that it is a family's duty—not the school's—to help children maintain the native language. "If parents had an option,"

says Lila Ramirez, vice president of the Burbank, Calif., Human Relations Council, "they'd prefer all-English to all-Spanish." When a U.S. Department of Education survey asked Mexican and Cuban parents what they wanted, four-fifths declared their opposition to teaching children in their native language if it meant less time devoted to English.

SENSE OF UNITY

It's time for federal and state legislators to overhaul this misbegotten program. The best policy for children—and for the country—is to teach English to immigrant children as quickly as possible. American-born Hispanics, who now make up more than half of all bilingual students, should be taught in English.

Bilingual education probably would end swiftly if more people knew about last November's meeting of the Texas Association for Bilingual Education, in Austin. Both the Mexican and U.S. flags adorned the stage at this gathering, and the attendees—mainly Texas teachers and administrators—stood as the national anthems of both countries were sung.

At least one educator present found the episode dismaying. "I stood, out of respect, when the Mexican anthem was played," says Odilia Leal, bilingual coordinator for the Temple Independent School District. "But I think we should just sing the U.S. anthem. My father, who was born in Mexico, taught me that the United States, not Mexico, is my country."

With 20 million immigrants now living in our country, it's more important than ever to teach newcomers to think of themselves as Americans if we hope to remain one people, not simply a conglomeration of different groups. And one of the most effective ways of forging that sense of unity is through a common language.

DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

SPEECH OF

HON. CONSTANCE A. MORELLA

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 25, 1995

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2076) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice and State, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes:

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Chairman, I had intended to offer an amendment to restore funding in the State-Commerce-Justice appropriations bill for the State Justice Institute. Since filing the amendment, I realized that a number of Members are not familiar with the work of the State Justice Institute, thereby leading me to conclude that it was not an opportune time to debate SJI funding. I withdrew the amendment.

But I want to let my colleagues know that there is a clear Federal interest in supporting programs like SJI, which promotes a just, effective, and innovative system of State courts. State courts have been the beneficiaries of more than 800 projects improving the quality of the justice they deliver, and the Federal judiciary has worked closely with SJI to improve the working relationship between the State and Federal courts.